

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-29 are pending, of which claims 1-4, 8-16, 19-20, 22-23, and 26-29 have been amended. The amendments to claims 1-4,
5 8-16, 19-20, 22-23, and 26-29 are simply to provide clarification and/or to correct an informality, and are not to overcome prior art or any other objections.

Non-Statutory Double Patenting Rejection

10 Claims 1-29 are rejected under the judicial doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-33 of U.S. Patent No. 6,718,408 to Esterberg et al., assignee Hewlett-Packard Development Company, L.P. The present application is a continuation of U.S. Patent No. 6,718,408.

15 A terminal disclaimer is submitted herewith to overcome the double patenting rejection in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.321(c). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

20 Claims 2-3, 6-7, 12, 18, 21, and 25 are indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant appreciates the indication of allowability. Other than the amendments to provide clarification as described above, these claims remain unchanged and are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon the respective independent claims.

25

35 U.S.C. §103 Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 4-5, 8-11, 13-17, 19-20, 22-24, and 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over U.S. Patent No. 5,805,412 to Yanagisawa et al. (hereinafter, "Yanagisawa") (*Office Action* p.3). Applicant
5 respectfully traverses the claim rejections.

Claim 1 recites a system comprising "an input/output module configured for installation within a housing of the mobile computing device, the input/output module including one or more input/output connectors".
10 Yanagisawa does not teach "an input/output module configured for installation within a housing of the mobile computing device", as recited in claim 1.

Yanagisawa describes a docking unit (200) that can be coupled with and separated from a notebook computer, and that has a connector which engages a docking connector of the notebook computer (*Yanagisawa* col.5, lines 31-36;
15 Figs. 1 and 5). Yanagisawa does not show or describe that the docking unit or the connector is "configured for installation within a housing of the mobile computing device", as recited in claim 1. The connector of docking unit (200) merely engages the docking connector on a rear face of the notebook computer (*Yanagisawa* col.7, lines 12-14).

20 The Office cites Yanagisawa for teaching an input/output module "configured for removable association" with the computing device (*Office Action* p.3). However, claim 1 does not recite an input/output module *configured for removable association* with the computing device, as the Office indicates. Issued U.S. Patent No. 6,718,408, from which the present
25 application is a continuation, recites "a first input/output module configured for removable association with the computing device" (*see* claim 1), and may have been inadvertently referenced here.

Accordingly, claim 1 along with dependent claims 2-13 are allowable over Yanagisawa which does not show "an input/output module configured for installation within a housing of the mobile computing device, the input/output module including one or more input/output connectors ...", as recited in claim 1. Further, the Office has not provided a *prima facie* rejection of a "module configured for installation within a housing of the mobile computing device", as recited in claim 1, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

Independent claims 14, 22, and 26 recite a similar feature of an input/output module configured for installation within a mobile computer or mobile computer housing. For example:

Claim 14 recites "an interchangeable input/output module configured for installation within a mobile computer, the interchangeable input/output module comprising one or more input/output connectors supported by a module housing". The Office cites Yanagisawa for teaching an interchangeable input/output module for a computer, but disregards that claim 14 also recites that the interchangeable input/output module is "configured for installation within a mobile computer" (*Office Action* p.7).

Accordingly, claim 14 along with dependent claims 15-21 are allowable over Yanagisawa. Further, the Office has not provided a *prima facie* rejection of "an interchangeable input/output module configured for installation within a mobile computer", as recited in claim 14, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

25

Claim 22 recites "an input/output module configured for installation within a housing of a mobile computer". The Office cites Yanagisawa for

teaching an input/output module "configured for removable attachment to a computer" (*Office Action* p.9). However, claim 22 does not recite an input/output module *configured for removable attachment* to a computer, as the Office indicates. Issued U.S. Patent No. 6,718,408, from which the present application is a continuation, recites "an input/output module configured for removable attachment to a computer" (*see* claim 22), and may have been inadvertently referenced here.

Accordingly, claim 22 along with dependent claims 23-24 are allowable over Yanagisawa. Further, the Office has not provided a *prima facie* rejection of "an input/output module configured for installation within a housing of a mobile computer", as recited in claim 22, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 26 recites "an interchangeable input/output module that is installed within a housing of a mobile computing device". The Office cites Yanagisawa for teaching an interchangeable input/output module for a computer, but disregards that claim 26 also recites that the interchangeable input/output module is "installed within a housing of a mobile computing device" (*Office Action* p.7).

Accordingly, claim 26 along with dependent claims 27-29 are allowable over Yanagisawa. Further, the Office has not provided a *prima facie* rejection of "an interchangeable input/output module that is installed within a housing of a mobile computing device", as recited in claim 26, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

25

Conclusion

Pending claims 1-29 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that preclude issuance of this application, the Examiner is

5 urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: Aug. 9, 2004

By: 

David A. Morasch
Reg. No. 42,905
(509) 324-9256 x 210

10